

98-84370-9

Kelley, Francis Clement

A sociologist in Mexico

New York

[c1923]

98-84370-9

MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308	Kelley, Francis Clement, bp., 1870-
Z	A sociologist in Mexico, by ... Francis C.
Box 490	Kelley ... New York, The Paulist press c1923.
	23 p. 1920

166950

only 1.1

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mmREDUCTION RATIO: 9:1IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIBDATE FILMED: 3/27/98INITIALS: F.C.TRACKING #: 25494

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

A Sociologist in Mexico

By

Right Rev. Francis C. Kelley, D.D., LL.D.



New York
THE PAULIST PRESS
401 West 59th Street

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

due on the date inc
the period after t
or by

A Sociologist in Mexico

BY

Right Rev. Francis C. Kelley, D.D., LL.D.

New York
THE PAULIST PRESS
401 West 59th Street

COPYRIGHT, 1923, BY "THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF ST. PAUL THE
APOSTLE IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK"

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

BY RIGHT REV. FRANCIS C. KELLEY, D.D., LL.D.



ON the face of the returns it might well be thought that Mexico has been sufficiently investigated, since of "investigators" there is no end. Magazines and dailies have for a long time had the habit of sending special writers and reporters to "get at the truth." Each "investigator" has been selected with care—we have the assurances of editors on that point—the care being that his views should coincide with the editorial policy of the sender. When I hear of a new "investigator" going across the *Rio Bravo*, I failed to work up any particular enthusiasm about it, because long experience has told me what to expect. The goal of nearly all these gentlemen is Mexico City, where the hotels are fairly good and the hospitality of government officials beyond reproach. I had some hope of a real statement of fact when Dr. E. J. Dillon went down there. I lost it when I saw his picture with a "party"—the dignified Doctor in shirt sleeves—made up chiefly of government officials. He ran true to "investigator" form. Special cars and parties tell the story of most of them. They come back calling Obregon "Alvaro" and de la Huerta "Adolpho." Calles has to be treated with a little more respect for his impassive face. But, in general, one cannot be

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

too hard on a lot of excellently disposed *politicos* who, after all, are presidents and cabinet ministers, and are not hampered by a stingy disposition. One can say a good word about their motives at least, while remaining silent about the past and hopeful about the future.

I must admit, however, that it would be an injustice to put Professor Edward Alsworth Ross, of the University of Wisconsin, author of *The Social Revolution in Mexico*,¹ into the class of the average "investigator." True, he did not stay long in Mexico. He admits that he tarried there for only eleven weeks; but he has a good right to urge that eleven weeks given to serious study by a trained sociologist count for something. He puts himself out of the reporter-investigator class by his frank and not always complimentary criticisms of those in power. On the whole, his book gives the impression that he took his task seriously. I do not agree with all his statements nor with his general conclusions, but that does not mean that I disagree with him *in toto*, as I usually do with the general run of the "investigators."

There were two fundamental weaknesses in Professor Ross that interfered with his judgment and led him into false conclusions. One was his leaning to revolution and the other his lack of historical knowledge. There is no particular wonder about the average professional sociologist having the leaning for revolt that the Professor shows. People have come to recognize that as a sociological state of mind.

¹*The Social Revolution in Mexico.* By Edward Alsworth Ross, Ph.D., LL.D. New York: The Century Co. \$1.75.

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

Professor Ross entered upon his Mexican task, whether he knew it or not, with the conviction that he just had to make a case for the revolution. It was a hard job, and so he recognized it. He admits that out of all the "chronic revolutionism of Mexico and South America," not much improvement was produced. But then, there was improvement, for he says, "The progress in government is slow," but there is progress. The same could be said if Spain had never been driven out of Latin-America. Revolution traveled at a snail's pace, while peace, even in bondage, would have gone on in a "flivver."

Spain? There's the rub, and the chief misfortune of the Professor as an "investigator." Ever since the Spanish Armada, the tradition of hatred for Spain has been in the blood of English-speaking peoples. The Reformation made the virus stronger. Strange, how a prejudice will hold its own in spite of the healing hand of time. We Americans fought England twice. We long ago contracted the habit of screaming at the British lion. But we took from England our dislike for Spain and the Spanish, our conviction that whatever Spain did must be wrong. We fed that conviction on false history—if we can call falsehood history at all. We swear by Prescott and Bancroft, not because we have confidence in them, but because they condemned Spain. I doubt if Professor Ross ever read Bandelier. If he did he is an exception to the average American. Professor Ross puts all blame for Mexico on Spain, but his book does not prove that he knows anything more than gossip about what Spain did in Mexico. It simply does not occur to Pro-

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

fessor Ross that possibly the blame might lie at the door of the revolution, for which he is a conservative, but open, apologist. That there is something wrong in Mexico is a fact undeniable. Who is to blame? All Americans, except a few scholars and their disciples, believe that the question was answered long ago. Spain and the Catholic Church is supposed to be the answer. Some writers on Mexico do not say that in so many words, but all imply it. Professor Ross says it in a more or less suave and diplomatic way.

Let us reason together a bit. It is very generally taken for granted that Mexico was once the seat of quite a superior civilization, as civilization ran in the days—say of the Pharaohs. The monuments now being uncovered read that fact into our historical records. Spain conquered Mexico. Therefore, Spain destroyed Mexico's ancient civilization. Does the reasoning sound good? It would be good enough, but for the fact that whatever civilization existed in Mexico before Cortez, was destroyed and buried centuries before a Spanish foot touched the soil of Anahuac. The Aztecs themselves were intruders and conquerors. Their own traditions, including that of the Eagle and Snake, admit it. When Cortez came, the old civilization was a vague memory. Its story had about the same relation to the people he found in Mexico that the story of Finn Mac Cool and the Giants has to the Irish. The Aztecs came to Mexico from the North. They destroyed what they found. They buried it and left it buried. What replaced it was not civilization, but a black and degraded con-

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

dition worse than death itself. The reason why we of the English speech weep salt tears over its destruction is because we have never yet found an anti-toxin for the poison of unreasonable hatred.

The facts about Aztec "civilization" are not hidden and never have been. War was so necessary a part of it that it could not have existed without bloodshed. Orozco y Berra says of the heart of it all—its religion:

"The cult was truly horrific; it demanded a constant shedding of blood . . . the mind revolts in horror at the sight of the human victim, not only immolated by the stroke of the knife, but offered up in other exquisite forms under a refinement of cruelty. Any religion omitting such a barbarity is better than that. To sweep it from the fact of the earth was an immense benefit; to substitute Christianity for it was to advance an immense distance on the road of civilization. To us this conclusion is evident, axiomatic, as clear as the light of midday."²

Cannibalism was one of the practices of this "civilization." Cortez, Sahagún, Motolinia, and Durán all speak about it and its revolting horrors. The *Laws of the Indies* admit its existence by prohibiting its practice. Whatever civilization Cortez found, the white man was responsible for, according to the traditions of the Aztecs themselves. Sahagún refers to the traditions of white settlers who came across the sea and taught the people. The legend of the "White God" is based on this. But what the whites taught degenerated as the Indian blood submerged the descendants of the strangers. The still more ancient

²*Historia Antigua de México.*

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

people had been submerged by the Aztec conquerors long before. Susan Hale did not write her *Story of Mexico* without at least consulting the discoveries of such men as Bandelier. Here is one of her paragraphs that tells the story of the ancient "civilization" very much as it deserves to be told:

"Empires and palaces, luxury and splendor, fill the accounts of the Spaniards; and imagination loves to adorn the halls of the Montezumas with the glories of an Oriental tale. Later explorers, with the fatal penetration of our time, destroy the splendid vision, reducing the emporor to a chieftain, the glittering retinue to a horde of savages, the magnificent capital of palaces to a pueblo of adobe. The discouraged enthusiast sees his magnificent civilization devoted to art, literature, and luxury, reduced to a few handfuls of pitiful Indians, quarrelling with one another for supremacy, and sighs to think his sympathies may have been wasted on the sufferings of an Aztec sovereign dethroned by the invading Spaniard."

She adds that "enough fact is left to build up a respectable case for the early races of Mexico." Admitted, but the "early races" were not the Indians Cortez met and conquered, but the races blotted out in blood by the invading Aztecs and their kind.

It is only fair to the Spaniard to stress these things. It gives us an idea of the magnitude of the task he entered upon in trying to Christianize and civilize the Mexican Indian. It is fair, also, to study the subject of the effort, for a measure of credit or condemnation depends on the difficulty of the work. What mental foundation was there to work on in the

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

Mexican Indian? Professor Ross himself helps us to know that. He quotes figures resulting from intelligence tests made in California. I need not repeat them, for the results are thus summed up in the quotation of Professor Ross from the investigations of Professor Terman of Stanford University:

"The mental tests for the American Indian indicate that he is not greatly superior to the average negro. Our Mexican population, which is largely of Indian extraction, makes little, if any better showing."

The slightly better showing is because of the white admixture. Professor Ross does not hold these modern intelligence tests to be infallible; but it will interest him to know that they check up well, so far as the Mexican Indian is concerned, with earlier findings. The Mexican Indians came from the North. There is only a very slight mental difference found among Indians of the whole American continent.³ But the North American Indian was not a cannibal to the same extent as his brother of Mexico. In that respect at least he was a better subject for uplift.

Spain's case is an easy one to put before the court for judgment. Her apologist can make comparisons with another case under the very eyes of the judges. With practically the same material to work on, how do Spain's results show beside those of England? A sentence answers: English colonization was a destroyer; Spain's a preserver. Both Spain and England lost their colonies. But when they did, Spain's were taken by the descendants of the people she found in them; England's were taken by the descend-

³See Moffett, *The American Indian on the New Trail*.

ants of her own settlers, while the children of the soil were "going West" in more than the literal sense of the words. Which record is the more creditable? England did not even try to civilize the Indians for generations. Spain began to do so at once. England simply transplanted to America a people already civilized and built on them. Spain worked on what she found, in spite of its poor quality, and produced rather remarkable results. Too late did the inheritors of English effort make attempts to uplift our surviving Indians. We failed, for the American Indian has never produced a single leader in any trade or profession. Never did a full-blooded North American Indian distinguish himself in anything but fighting. Spain can point to a long line of Mexican Indians who did distinguish themselves under every and all circumstances. Some words I wrote about eight years ago will bear repetition here:

"Let us be fair. Spain *preserved* where we *destroyed*. With a constantly diminishing Indian population, wards of the State, having schools and colleges for all who wish to enter them, what one of our Indians has ever shown the governmental and military genius of a Diaz, the intelligent bravery of a Mejía, the surgical ability of a Urrutia, the philosophical knowledge of a Munguía, the science of a Carrillo y Azcona, the theological training of an Alarcón, the poetic fire of an Altamirano, the political acumen of an Estagnol, the legal and journalistic career of Sanchez Santos, the artistic talents of Panduro and Velazquez? Indians? Yes, all Indians. Name those of ours whose genius has made such marks on the

history of our country. Sitting Bull? Geronimo? Alas! such a beginning speaks badly for an ending. Think this over before you condemn Spanish civilization in the Americas. We have little to show for one hundred years of 'Anglo-Saxon' attempts to uplift our Indians. Yet the Indians of Mexico have produced men of letters, artists, statesmen, soldiers, scientists, learned bishops and priests—men of genius."⁴

Professor Ross opens his chapter on "Public Education" with this statement: "The beginning of a system of public education in Mexico dates from 1867." This will explain why it is unwise to be a sociologist at the expense of a knowledge of history, for no matter in what sense Professor Ross may explain his meaning, his readers will, very generally, take his words to mean that not until 1867 did Mexicans have an opportunity to secure an education. Public education, in the sense in which the term is used in this country, is not much older than 1867. Horace Mann died in 1859, and he is called the Father of the American Public School. The Fathers of the Republic knew no such system. The religious schools were the educational nurseries of the greatest Americans. But 1867 was no year of glory for Mexican education. It was a year that saw many schools closed for the one that was opened.

As in the United States, the pioneers of education in Mexico were the clergy, and there was no hesitation about taking up the burden; but, unlike the English colonists, the Spaniards at once went out with it to the Indian population. The letters of Cortez tell

⁴Kelley, *The Book of Red and Yellow*.

of friars coming at his request while he was still in command. In 1723, there were 2,396 of three Orders only. In 1570, there were fifty-one Franciscan missions in the Archdiocese of Mexico alone, and a school in each where children were taught to read and write. The friars had not teachers enough, for they kept calling for more. No church was without its school. Sahagún established a college at Santa Cruz, in spite of those who said that the Indians were incapable of learning. But Indian professors were trained, and the school was turned over to their care. A complaint against the clergy for their activities in education was sent by one Lopez to the King. It is an enlightening document.⁵ He says that the friars had taught large numbers of Indians to read and write; that they were such excellent penmen "that it is a marvel to see them"; that there are "so many and such good scriveners" that he cannot count them. He even charges that the friars have taught the Indians Latin so well that "they speak it like another Cicero," and "every day the number grows." Pity we could not voice such a complaint to some one about our annual flock of American A. B.'s who know "little Latin and less Greek." The law for the education of the Indians provided for "schools wherever possible" at "no cost" to the Indians.⁶ The laws of the Church put the obligation of establishing schools on "every curate." The first Archbishop of Mexico and the Viceroy Mendoza set up the first printing press in America. This Archbishop saw an Indian

⁵*Col. de Doc. para la Hist. de Méx.*, II., 148.

⁶*Laws of the Indies*, "Recap. de Indies," Lib. VI., Tit. I., Ley 18.

graduate of Sahagún's College of Santa Cruz become a Professor of Spanish and Governor of the City of Mexico. What Indian became Governor of Plymouth? In 1544 this printing press was turning out books for the natives who could read. The Viceroy explained the quantity turned out by the fact that "there were so many who could read and write." Thomas Gage, an Englishman, wondered at the wealth and power in the hands of "Indian Dons" who were even governors. Humboldt was in Mexico in 1803 and wrote of the prosperity of the Indians. Trade schools were not wanting.⁷ The University of Mexico was opened in 1553. Two hundred and four years before Harvard took up the study of medicine, this university had its medical school. Eighty-six years before Hunter opened the first school of dissection in England, Mexico had started the study of anatomy and surgery with dissection. It would take volumes to write the story of the educational activity of Spanish Mexico. Hospitals were built as well as colleges. On a recent visit to Mexico I found myself on the same train with one of the famous Doctors Mayo of Rochester, Minn., and several of his staff, who were going, as guests of Dr. Oschner of Chicago, to inspect a wonderful hospital at Guadalajara. Dr. Oschner explained that it was built three hundred years ago by a bishop, and was even to-day the model of its kind. Humboldt wrote of Mexico's educational establishments:

"The capital and several other cities have scientific establishments which will bear a comparison with

⁷*Doc. para la Historia de México*, Segunda Serie, Mexico, 1855, Vol. IV.

those of Europe. . . . No city of the new continent, without even excepting those of the United States, can display such great and solid scientific establishments as the capital of Mexico."

What happened to all these? Revolution. It emancipated the child from its mother's apron strings before it could walk. After "independence" came chaos, and Juarez was the worst of the destroyers. The whole educational, social, and charitable edifice that the Church had constructed was swept into the hands of *politicos* who plundered it for private gain. The Indians relapsed into ignorance, and many into savagery. The wealthy landowners, whose greed had been curbed by the *Laws of the Indies* and by the watchful bishops, now had freedom to do as they pleased. The Indians fell with the power that protected them, even if it also kept them in order. Mexico, once far in advance of the United States in wealth, industry, education, charity, and refinement, allowed her half-breed sons to extinguish her light in blood. No one gained but the revolutionists.

I have merely sketched in the historic background that Professor Ross should have had for his book. Either he ignored it or was ignorant of it. So he came to judgment without the facts before him, and consequently judged badly. He holds that the revolution was a success, and he praises Juarez. But it was the revolution, and particularly Juarez, who took all from the Indian and gave nothing in return. It was Juarez who offered to sell a part of his country to the United States.⁸ He it was who destroyed the very communal

⁸See McLenn-Ocampo Treaty.

holding that the present revolutionary government is trying to give back by the confiscation process. When he took from the clergy the right to establish schools, he doomed the country to go without education. Had we done such a thing in the United States, we should have scarcely any of our present great colleges and universities. If justice were half done, the whole evil brood of fighters, from Hidalgo, the rebellious priest, to Carranza, the egotistical atheist, would be cursed from the *Rio Bravo* to the Guatemala border—and across it, for bad example fast traveled south.

I was not greatly surprised over the attitude of Professor Ross toward the Church, as set forth in the ninth chapter of his book. Perhaps I should have been surprised had it been different. My dealings with "investigators" have taught me what to expect, when the unconscious prejudices of generations are awakened by the smell of incense and made active by a hymn of hate. The Church at least is used to it. Nor was I scandalized much by the illogical attitude of an American university professor, since I had already noted the effect produced on his knowledge of history by his devotion to sociology. What did trouble me was his attitude before a situation which, weighed by American standards of justice and democracy, should have called up his principles to battle his prejudices. He says that "at first blush the Catholic Church, which has the allegiance of 95 per cent. of Mexican adults, seems to be hounded and persecuted by the States." "At first blush" and "seems" give the keynote of the chapter headed "The Church."

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

Professor Ross does not conceal the facts of this "seeming" persecution. He states them fairly and fully. In this brief review I need only sum them up: The Church in Mexico cannot hold property necessary even for religious purposes, much less for the care of its clergy and its labors of education and charity; nor can it possess endowment in any form. It cannot conduct primary schools or solicit funds outside a church building, nor hold a religious service outside, even if only to say a prayer from its ritual over a grave. No clergyman may wear a clerical dress in public, whether it be a Roman collar, a white necktie, or a Salvation Army cap; neither may clergymen exercise their rights as citizens, either by inheriting property (except from blood relatives), discussing politics (except in favor of the existing government), or even voting. The State has the right to determine how many priests or ministers are needed for any community; etc., etc., etc. The disability list is rather long. The inference drawn by Professor Ross from the length and malignity of it is interesting. He says that from it "one may safely deduce that Mexico has been the theater of a prolonged and desperate struggle between Church and State." One might also deduce the fact that the State had been in a prolonged, desperate struggle to blot out religion so far as "95 per cent. of Mexican adults" are concerned. But Professor Ross did not deduce that, for, later on, he assures his readers that religious freedom prevails in Mexico "so far as the laws can insure it," since "there is no interference in religious rites or functions." After enumerating the anti-religious laws, the Pro-

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

fessor compliments the intelligence of his American readers with the foregoing assurance of "religious freedom." Alas for his estimate of the average intelligence of his fellow citizens!

We shall pass all that and come to a consideration of the reasons offered to justify the anti-religious laws. One stands out beyond the others. Here it is: "The Catholic Hierarchy controlled two-thirds of the productive wealth of the country." That statement is not the truth. Professor Ross accepted it as the truth on the word of men who have been repeating it so often that, in spite of the facts, they have come to think that it must be true. One cannot be guileless with a Mexican *politico*. It is not my duty to teach history to university professors, but it seems as if I must do it over and over again with Professor Ross. So I shall have to reopen the class by jotting down some statistics already given the Senate of the United States in its investigation of Mexican affairs in April, 1920.

Dr. Mora was an apostate priest and one of the most insistent advocates of the confiscation of the wealth of the Church. He could be trusted to make out as good a case as possible for confiscation. Endeavoring to scandalize the people by showing the Church to be extremely rich, he works out a capital thus: He multiplies the church collections for 1829 by twenty and charges the result against the Church as capital. He estimates that every parish priest received \$600 a year, multiplies this by twenty and sets the result down as capital. Money received for charity is subjected to the same process. He does other

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

extraordinary things with the property, productive and unproductive. The total capital is then given as \$119,131,860. The income, and in this he includes what ought to have been earned by the unproductive property, is given as \$7,456,593. To all this he adds his valuation of churches and their contents, and finally places the wealth of the Mexican Church at the sum of \$179,163,754.⁹ Duarte gives the total church wealth as \$184,614,800.¹⁰ These are figures made by the enemies of the Church. The truth was more nearly arrived at by the Government which confiscated the wealth and property of the Church. Its work was finished in 1866, and the valuation set down at \$62,365,516. Previous to this the King of Spain did a little confiscating on his own account. Adding what he received to the above figure, we have a fair estimate of the wealth of the Church. It was \$72,873,473.88, which figure includes hospitals, schools, colleges, lands, houses, and invested funds at the time of the Church's greatest prosperity. To make the figure as large as truth will permit, let me add an estimate of the value of chalices, vestments, etc., as well as the value of actual church buildings used only for worship, and place the total at the round figure of \$100,000,000. Are the readers of the Professor's book to conclude that this represented two-third's of the wealth of Mexico?

A distinguished Mexican churchman, discussing this question with me, expressed doubt as to the correctness of the figures I have given, on the ground

⁹*Obras Sueltas*, I., 372. Figures for the end of 1832.

¹⁰*Diccionario de Curiosidades Históricas*.

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

that property was confiscated in several out-of-the-way places and no returns made to the Government. It was simply taken out of hand by the local authorities, used as they pleased, or allowed to fall into ruin. But allowing for this would not greatly change the result, for in these districts the property would not be of great value; and I have not made allowance for the fact that the confiscations were not confined strictly to the Church and its educational and charitable endowments. Civil corporations also were seized and the returns included in the given valuation. It must be remembered that the confiscations included charitable and educational endowments which were under the control, not of the Church but of laymen, endowments like those of the Carnegie or Rockefeller Institutes. If the Mexican people devoted two-thirds of their wealth to religion and such endowments, the fact would stamp them as the most generous and public-spirited people in the whole world.

Let me ask the Professor to exercise his love of justice a moment by comparing this with the endowments of American colleges and universities. He can supply the figures himself and be as conservative as he pleases, in jotting them down. The standardizing bodies, East and West, have them listed. Let him begin with the University of Chicago and its \$33,000,000, and include Yale, Harvard, Columbia, Dartmouth, Princeton. What a pittance was the wealth of the Church in Mexico compared to the results Professor Ross will find!

Again, the Baptist denomination in the United States, according to its own yearbook, in 1916 had

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

51,248 churches. Its invested funds and properties amounted to \$98,453,844. Its income that year was \$43,055,007. Its churches and other unproductive properties were valued at \$173,705,800. It had 36,926 ministers against Mexico's 10,112 priests. At the time of greatest prosperity, the Church in Mexico had about \$26,000,000 less invested funds and property than the American Baptist denomination had in 1916; \$36,000,000 less income; and \$120,000,000 less in churches and unproductive property. The figures are worth consideration. Make as liberal an allowance as one pleases for the difference in money value, and still the fact stands out that Professor Ross was villainously imposed upon by somebody when he stated that the Church possessed two-thirds of the wealth of Mexico.

Who benefited by the confiscation of the wealth given to the Church in trust for good works? That part of the story is not cheerful. Education benefited not at all. Justo Serra wrote:

"The laws of December 12th and 14th, 1872, completed the confiscation of the endowment funds which had been created to support the educational institutions of the republic. The great private foundations which had accumulated through three centuries were swept away and no others were created to replace them."

The Government received very little, for all revolutionary governments have their "friends." One example will suffice to show where the money and property went. The father of a great and wealthy finance minister under Diaz received judicial posses-

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

sion on March 4th, 1861, of some fifty houses that once represented church endowment in the City of Mexico, valued at \$525,528.00. He secured this property for \$1,832.40 in cash, and the balance was paid in government duebills that had cost him \$40,077.70. The new owner's total investment was therefore \$41,910.10 for a property valued at \$525,528.00. Hospitals, colleges, orphanages, schools, seminaries, etc., all went, and few of them were kept to the purposes of their foundations. They became prisons, barracks, city halls. I myself have seen prisons that were hospitals, and colleges that once were filled with students but are now empty and desolate.

If Professor Ross would present a picture to us of what happened to Mexico through revolution, he might suggest for consideration the possible confiscation of every religious, charitable, and educational endowment in the United States; the changing of the colleges, asylums, orphanages, schools, into public buildings, or their sale or ruin; the giving of the productive property to "deserving Democrats" or deserving Republicans or deserving Socialists, at their own price; the transfer to the Government of every church building and the consequent closing of many; the disfranchisement of all American clergymen and the nullifying of their citizenship, simply because they were clergymen; the—but is it necessary to go on? The thing is unthinkable. It would be a crime against justice and right, a crime against civilization and common decency. But the Professor did not say that about the same crime in Mexico. He even defended the commission of the crime, and defended it

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

in the name of social justice and in the much abused name of democracy and "nineteenth century political ideals."

I have a sadder picture to present to Professor Ross, the sociologist, than the one sketched above. It also has the advantage of having been painted from actual happenings on Mexican soil. It is the picture of the ruin of small Mexican landowners. I shall make one quotation, which, however, tells only a part of a story, verified by a wealth of authorities. Juan A. Mateos, in a speech in the Mexican Chamber of Deputies, October 20th, 1893, said:

"In the days of the old régime, when the clergy possessed a great number of city and country properties, year after year went by without the shameful evictions to which so many poor families are the victims to-day. The sordid avarice of the landlords of to-day had no compassion, in contrast to the clergy who, animated by a spirit truly Christian, overlooked and excused. The Church loaned its capital at a low rate of interest: 4%, 5%, or 6%, which was called the legal rate, a rate unknown to-day. Very rarely was a foreclosure notice published against a property pledged for a loan from these funds. For this reason, I proposed, at the time of their confiscation, that a bank for the poor be established from the millions of the clergy, but my voice was drowned in the midst of the tumult of passions of the revolution. Because of this, the selfish interests and exactions of to-day have left homeless the many families who formerly enjoyed the tolerance and charity of the clergy."

To-day our own Government prides itself on hav-

A SOCIOLOGIST IN MEXICO

ing established farm loans for the small proprietors. Mexico had them for centuries before, and the Church made them out of her endowments. The loan shark of Mexico has had good reason to follow the red flag. Confiscation boomed his business.

I do not know the religion of Professor Ross. From his statement that "the Protestant Church is congenial to one's intellect and conscience," I presume that he has at least a nodding acquaintance with some American Protestant body. As a Catholic, I am not supposed by the Professor to be surrounded with such an atmosphere of intellectual life and honesty. In that, he has the advantage of me. I belong to an antiquated relic of the past, the Church of the Million Martyrs, the Mother of Civilization, the Refuge of the Poor, the Church of the ancestors of Professor Ross. I am one of those unfortunates who "tell their beads," and fail to grasp the great modern principles that justify slander, exalt theft, and sanction murder. But, thank God, I am not entirely blind. I have at least enough sight left to see who ruined Mexico, and know that he was not a Spaniard, nor yet a child of the ancient Faith. His name was Greed, and he is still alive and active.

Ignorance

is the greatest enemy of the Church.

What are you doing to combat it?

THE CATHOLIC WORLD
has been recognized as the
leading Catholic Monthly for
over sixty years. It is pub-
lished by the Paulist Fathers.

*Send in your order
today. Your sub-
scription will begin
with the next number.*

Special
Introductory
offer

[4 Months
for only \$1.00]

THE CATHOLIC WORLD
120 West 60th St., New York, N. Y.

I am enclosing one dollar. Please enter my subscription for
four months to begin with your next issue.

Name-----

Address-----

For Catholic and Non-Catholic

The Controversial Pamphlet Package

Price Fifty Cents Postpaid

What the Catholic Church Is and What She Teaches. Rev.
E. R. Hull, S.J.

What Is the Catholic Church? Rev. R. Felix, O.S.B.

The Divinity of Christ. Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P.

The Authorized Interpreter of Holy Scriptures. William H.
Sloane.

The Spread of the Church a Proof of Her Divinity. Rev.
J. A. O'Brien, Ph.D.

The Virgin Birth. Rev. B. L. Conway, C.S.P.

The Immaculate Conception. Rev. J. B. Jaggard, S.J.

Is One Church as Good as Another? Rev. John B. Harney,
C.S.P.

Why I Am a Catholic. Rev. John B. Harney, C.S.P.

Why Not Be a Catholic? Rev. M. D. Forrest, M.S.C.

*Upon request we will also include our free catalogue
listing some three hundred pamphlets on all subjects
concerning the Catholic Church.*

THE PAULIST PRESS

401 West 59th Street

New York, N. Y.

MSH 23484

**END OF
TITLE**